

## REMARKS

### Election/Restrictions

In the Office Action, the Examiner states the Application contains the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: The species of Figures 2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c, and 7d.

For purposes of expediting the prosecution on the Application, the Applicant is hereby electing, without traverse, the species Figures 2, 3a, 3b, 7a, 7b, 7c, and 7d and recited in Claims 1-4, and 7-20. It is noted that in the present election of species, the Applicants are not making a statement that the species identified in the office action are, or are not, patentably distinct from other species identified in the requirement of election/restriction. Instead, the Applicants are electing species in the interest of expediting the prosecution of the application. The Applicants further submit that in view of MPEP § 806.04(f), the claim limitations recited in Claims 1-4, and 7-20 are not mutually exclusive characteristics and that further election of species is therefore not required.

Conclusion


In light of the above-listed remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the Claims. Claims 1-4, and 7-20 remain pending.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 6/30/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_

John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Registration No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060